

REMARKS

Claims 1–3, 6, 7, 12, and 13 have been amended. Claims 14–25 have been added. Claim 10 has been canceled. The application now includes claims 1–9 and 11–25.

Concurrently filed with this amendment is a request for continued examination (RCE).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite “an antenna base which does not contain an antenna element, coupled to the antenna case at a fixed end, wherein said antenna case is permitted to pivot at said fixed end relative to said antenna base such that a free end of said antenna case moves toward or away from said antenna base during pivoting” and “an angle regulator for adjusting a relative angle between the antenna case and the antenna base by pivoting said antenna case relative to said antenna base at said fixed end”.

Claim 12, like claim 1, has been amended to require that the antenna case pivots at a fixed end relative to the antenna base where a free end of the antenna base moves towards or away from the antenna base during pivoting. This is shown in drawing figures 3a, 3b, 5, 6c, 9a and 10a of the application. In operation, the base (e.g., “4” in Figures 3b, 5, 6c, 9a, and 10a) is affixed to a surface (e.g., wall, table top, window, or any other surface). One end of the antenna case is coupled to the antenna base, and the other end (the free end) is moved toward or away from the antenna base by pivoting at the fixed end. As shown in Figures 2 and 11, the ability to move the free end of the antenna case allows for optimizing the ability to receive signals of interest to the use. This feature of optimization is set forth in dependent claims 15 and 25.

Claim 12 is drawn to the cable groove guide in the base face of the antenna base, as is best shown in 7, 8a-b, 9b, and 10b. Original claims 8 and 9 of the application are also drawn to this feature. Claim 20 is directed to the latching mechanism shown in detail in Figure 8a. As can be seen in Figures 9a-b and 10a-b, a particular embodiment allows the cable to extend out either a first side or a second side of the antenna base depending on the needs or desires of the user. The ability to latch the cable in the cable groove so that it extends out one side or the other of the antenna base is set forth in claim 21. New claims 18 and 19 are drawn

to the cable passing from the antenna case to the antenna base as is shown in detail in Figures 7, 9b and 10b of the application.

As is discussed on page 6, lines 7–9, it is indicated that the claimed invention can be used for GPS signal transmissions, satellite broadcasting signal applications, cellular telephone applications, and the like. All of these applications involve sending or receiving signals to a device remote from the antenna apparatus itself. Dependent claims 14 and 24 are specifically directed to a satellite broadcasting signal application, as is discussed on page 6, lines 7–9.

Page 6 of the application, at line 15, discusses having a low noise amplifier circuit board positioned with the antenna element in the antenna case. New claims 16 and 17 require this feature.

New claim 23, dependent on claim 12, recites the feature that the “antenna element functions for transmitting or receiving signals to or from a device remote from said antenna apparatus”.

Claim 1 has been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,636,181 to Asano. This rejection is traversed in view of the amendment above.

As amended, independent claim 1 requires that the base does not include an antenna element. That is, in the present application, the antenna element is contained in the antenna case, and the antenna case is pivotally moveable relative to the antenna base which is mounted on, for example, a planar surface such as a floor, wall, table top, or other surface. As explained on page 6 of the application at lines 12–14, the “antenna apparatus 1 has an antenna case 2 for containing the antenna element” (emphasis added). This feature also being based on the Examiner’s statement at the page 7 of the office action, where it appears to be acknowledged that Asano does not show a suggest a device where the antenna element is only within the antenna case.

In sharp contrast, U.S. Patent 6,363,181 to Asano is directed to eliminating a signal cable between a base unit and a lid unit of a computer (note particularly Figure 20, the “prior art” of Asano where a signal cable 192 passes through a hinge in the computer). In Asano, both the base unit and the lid unit include an antenna. See particularly antenna 109 in the lid unit communicating with antenna 106 in the base unit in Figure 2 of Asano. Similarly, the second embodiment of Asano shows, in Figures 8 and 10, antenna 109 in the lid unit and antenna 106 in

the hinge on the base unit. Thus, in Asano, the transmitter/receivers are used for transmitting high frequency signals between the base unit and lid of the same computer device, and the present invention wholly lacks this feature.

Claims 1, 2, 12, and 13 have been rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,861,181 to DeSargent.

Independent claims 1 and 12 now specifically require that the antenna case pivot so as to move a free end toward or away from the antenna base. This is best shown in Figures 3a, 3b, 5, 6c, 9a and 10a of the application.

In sharp contrast, DeSargent is drawn to an antenna reflector system which is mounted on an aircraft. Figure 3 of DeSargent shows an azimuthal axis of rotation 108 positioned behind the reflector deflector device. In operation, the DeSargent device rotates about axis 108. DeSargent does not show or suggest a pivoting mode of operation where an antenna case pivots relative to the antenna base whereby the antenna case gets relatively closer to or farther away from the antenna base. To the contrary, in DeSargent the antenna elements always remain a fixed distance away from the axis of rotation 108, and no pivoting movement between a "case" and a "base" is contemplated in DeSargent. Further, the undersigned notes that the characterization on page 3 of the office action identifying azimuth motor 110 and two channel joint 112 of DeSargent to be a "base", and the platform 106 to be a "case" is simply not correct. In DeSargent, the "base" would be the platform 106; hence the use of the word "platform" in DeSargent.

Claims 2 and 3 have been rejected as being obvious over either Asano or DeSargent in view of U.S. Patent 6,034,643 to Nishikawa. This rejection is traversed.

The differences between the claimed invention and Asano and DeSargent are discussed above. Nishikawa does not make up for the deficiencies of Asano or DeSargent, and claims 2 and 3 would not be obvious over any combination of Asano, DeSargent and Nishikawa. Nishikawa is directed to a directional beam antenna device which includes an antenna supporting member which is mounted on a rotatable base. Drives are provided for rotating the antenna device about its rotational axis. As explained in column 2, lines 59-64, which are cited by the Examiner, Nishikawa contemplates controlling the elevation angle and the

azimuth angle of the antenna beam. Nishikawa, quite simply, discloses no means for driving an angle regulator which regulates the angle between an antenna base and an antenna case, as is contemplated by claims 2 and 3 of the application (as such, no combination of Nishikawa and Asano or DeSargent, even if it could be made, would make obvious the claimed invention). Nishikawa does not show or describe having an antenna element in antenna case that is pivotally connected to an antenna base, and regulating the position of the antenna element by pivoting the case relative to the base. Quite the contrary, Nishikawa shows a rotational movement (more akin to DeSargent) and fails to contemplate a pivotal connection at all (a feature wholly lacking in DeSargent) and fails to contemplate the antenna element being only in the case (a feature lacking in Asano), and pivoting the case relative to the base (as discussed above, Nishikawa rotates the antenna, it does not pivot relative to a base). In view of the above, the claimed invention is not obvious over any combination of Nishikawa, DeSargent or Asano.

Claim 4 was rejected as being obvious over a combination of Asano or DeSargent in view of U.S. Patent 5,909,653 to Imura. This rejection is traversed.

Imura is related to a portable radio device where the antenna can be distanced from the user's face during use so as to prevent degradation of performance during use. In one embodiment, shown in Figures 1–3, the angle of the antenna 20 can be set and locked into position, and in another embodiment, shown in Figures 4 and 5, the antenna 20 can be moved from a position within the case to extend outward from the case.

Imura appears to have been relied upon as shown an ability to lock the antenna into a particular angle. However, the Examiner should note that Imura does not make up for the deficiencies of DeSargent and Asano, and no combination of the three references would make the claimed invention obvious. In particular, Imura would not make up for DeSargent's deficiency of not being able to pivot a antenna case towards and away from a antenna base. Quite the contrary, as noted above, DeSargent rotates the antenna device relative to an azimuth. Likewise, Imura does not show or suggest an antenna contained in a case which is pivotable relative to the a base. To the contrary, Imura shows an antenna that is extendable from a housing or rotatable relative to housing, but not positioned within a housing that is pivotable relative to a base. Thus, if combined with

Asano, the combination would still have an antenna in a base which is excluded by claim 1.

Further, Imura would not be combinable with DeSargant as it is directed to having an antenna reflector rotatable about a azimuth, while Imura is directed to locking an antenna into a position relative to a housing.

Likewise, Imura would not be combinable with Asano, since Asano contemplates having antenna devices within a base unit and a lid unit, while Imura contemplates having an antenna which is rotatable or extendable from a housing.

Claims 5–11 were rejected as being obvious over a combination of Asano or DeSargant in view of U.S. Patent 6,636,181 to Ogino. This rejection is traversed.

First, as noted above, Asano and Desargant do not disclose all the limitations of the invention except for the hook hole and a drawing out groove. As noted above, Desargant wholly lacks a case pivotally connected to a base, and Asano requires an antenna in both a lid and a base. Ogino fails to make up for the deficiencies of either Desargant or Asano. That is, Ogino does not show a case containing an antenna element where the case is pivoted relative to an antenna base.

Further, The Examiner has referenced Figure 6 as showing the hook hold and a drawing out groove. However, Figure 6 of Ogino is a top isometric view and does not show the base at all. Thus, Figure 6 shows neither the hook hole or the drawing out groove.

In sharp contrast to the claimed invention, the Examiner should note from Figure 7 of Ogino that the cover 206 that covers two rod antennas is contemplated in Ogino, and that these rod antennas can be deployed (see Figure 9 of Ogino). Of course, the claimed invention has an antenna element contained within an antenna case (see claims 1 and 12), and is therefore quite different from that shown in Ogino.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1–9 and 11–25 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local

telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

A provisional petition is hereby made for any extension of time necessary for the continued pendency during the life of this application. Please charge any fees for such provisional petition and any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C. Lamont Whitham', is written over the typed name.

C. Lamont Whitham

Reg. No. 22,424

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, VA 20190

Tel. (703) 787-9400
Fax. (703) 787-7557

Customer No.: 30743